

*Lobbyist Ordinance, San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code section 1.200 et seq.*  
Proposed Changes. The more significant proposed amendments are listed below.

<b>Item</b>	<b>Current Law</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Definition of "activity expenses" ((2.105(a)) (p. 2 of draft)	Activity expenses are expenses that may benefit a City officer who is contacted by a lobbyist. Activity expenses include gifts and other economic consideration totaling more than \$30 in a consecutive 3-month period.	Deletes "gifts" and reduces threshold amount of an activity expense to \$25.	Gifts made by lobbyists to City officers are governed by the "restricted source" rule, <i>see</i> S.F. Campaign & Gov'tal Conduct Code § 3.216(b), which generally prohibits gifts with a value of \$25 or more. Proposal eliminates overlapping regulation and harmonizes § 2.105(a) with the restricted source rule.
Exceptions to contacts (§2.105(d)(1)(D)) (p. 3 of draft)	Provides an exception for communications with City officers undertaken by licensed attorneys or architects, where those communications must be carried out by those types of professionals.	Amends this exception to include contacts with City officers made by professional engineers.	While this proposed amendment expands § 2.105(d)(1)(D), it permits the deletion of a separate exception created by § 2.105(d)(1)(P).
Exceptions to contacts (proposed §2.105(d)(1)(K)) (p. 5 of draft)	Provides an exception for contacts made by an expert.	Continues to permit contacts by an expert, so long as the expert's contact is made in the presence of a registered lobbyist.	The proposed change allows experts to share their views with City officials but, by requiring that such contacts take place in the presence of a registered lobbyist, ensures that such contacts are disclosed and reported.
Exceptions to contacts (proposed §2.105(d)(1)(O)) (p. 6 of draft)	None.	Adds following exception: "A person negotiating the terms of a contract after being selected to enter into a contract with the City and County through a competitive bidding process, or as otherwise permitted under the Administrative Code."	No exception currently exists for such communications, which are necessary for City contracting.

Exceptions to contacts (proposed §2.105(d)(1)(P)) (p. 6 of draft)	None.	Adds following exception: "A person appearing as a party or a representative of a party in an administrative proceeding before a City agency or department."	The proposed exception recognizes that contacts with City officers in the course of administrative proceedings should not constitute lobbying.
Exceptions to contacts (proposed §2.105(d)(1)(Q)) (p. 6-7 of draft)	None.	Adds following exception: "A person communicating on behalf of a labor union representing City employees, regarding the establishment, amendment, or interpretation of a collective bargaining agreement or memorandum of understanding with the City."	The proposed change creates an exception for communications between the City and labor unions, to the extent they pertain to collective bargaining. This narrow exception is necessary to allow for proper handling of labor issues in the City.
Exceptions to contacts (proposed §2.105(d)(1)(R)) (p. 7 of draft)	None.	Adds following exception: "A person participating in a public interested persons meeting, workshop, or other forum convened by a City agency or department for the purpose of soliciting public input."	The proposed exception facilitates the collection of public input by City agencies and departments.
"Lobbyist" (proposed §2.105(g)) (p. 7 of draft)	The ordinance currently establishes three categories of lobbyists: contract lobbyists, business and organization lobbyists, and expenditure lobbyists.	Eliminates these three categories of lobbyists and defines a lobbyist as any individual who receives economic consideration of \$3,000 or more within a three month period for lobbyist services and has a contact with a City officer.	The proposed change simplifies the application of the term "lobbyist" and the resulting reporting requirements.
Registration (§2.110(a)) (p. 11-12 of draft)	This section required registration prior to any contacts with a City officer.	Provides a longer time-period for registration, up to ten days after an initial contact. Also requires registration prior to any subsequent lobbying contacts.	The proposed amendment reflects changes to the definition of "lobbyist" and continues to require prompt registration.

Registration information (§2.110(b)) (p. 12 of draft)	Requires the filing of registration reports for each of the three existing categories of lobbyists.	The proposed amendments have been tailored to require the same registration information from any lobbyist.	The changes reflect the shift from multiple categories of lobbyists to a single category.
Reregistration (§2.110(c)) (p. 15 of draft)	This section requires annual re-registration no later than January 15.	Deleted.	Instead of requiring the filing of additional re-registration reports, the proposed changes focus on more frequent reporting, including the updating of any registration information.
Disclosures (proposed §2.110(c)) (p. 16-18 of draft)	The ordinance currently requires quarterly reporting, the requirements of which vary depending on the type of lobbyist.	Requires a single set of information from lobbyists and requires more frequent, monthly reporting.	The proposed changes simplify the reporting requirements but increase disclosure of lobbying activities.
Registration and filing by organizations (proposed §2.110(d)) (p. 20 of draft)	The ordinance currently requires reporting by organizations that employ multiple lobbyists.	Proposed changes similarly allow organizations to register and file disclosures on behalf of its lobbyists. A related change in section 2.145(e) provides that if an organization files on its lobbyists' behalf, the organization may also be held liable for any failures to abide by the ordinance.	Allowing firms and organizations employing multiple lobbyists to file on their lobbyists behalf is more convenient and reflects their existing practices. The related change in section 2.145(e) provides corresponding liability for organizations that file on their employees' behalf.
Fees (§2.110(e)) (p. 20-21 of draft)	Currently, the lobbyist ordinance imposes fees of \$500 per lobbyist and an additional \$75 per client.	Decrease fees to a single \$100 annual fee. Failure to pay the annual fee also constitutes cancellation of a lobbyist's registration with the Commission.	The proposed changes lower the fees for lobbyists, with a goal of lowering fees for smaller lobbying organizations and single-person lobbying firms. The proposal also eliminates the need for separate filings related to a lobbyist's termination of registration.
Client Authorization Statements (§2.110(f))	Requires the collection and filing of client authorization statements.	Deleted.	This deletion alleviates the filing obligations of lobbyists and the resources of the Ethics Commission.

(p. 21 of draft)			
Client Termination Statements (§2.110(g)) (p. 21-22 of draft)	Lobbyist must file a client termination form within fifteen days after a client terminates the lobbyist's services	Deleted.	See above.
Lobbyist Termination Statements (§2.110(h)) (p. 22 of draft)	Lobbyists must file termination statements.	See Fees (§2.110(e)).	See Fees (§2.110(e)).
Prohibitions: Gift Limit (§ 2.115(a)) (p. 22 of draft)	Lobbyists may not give gifts to a City officer aggregating more than \$50 within three months of contacting the officer.	Adds: "No lobbyist shall make gifts to an officer of the City and County that would result in a violation of section 3.216(b) of this Code."	The proposal eliminates overlapping regulation and harmonizes § 2.115(a) with the restricted source rule.
Lobbyist Training (proposed §2.116) (p. 23 of draft)	Requires the Commission to conduct quarterly workshops concerning lobbying in the City.	The proposed amendment would require lobbyists to complete a training at least once a year.	The proposed change focuses on whether lobbyists receive training rather than dictating when such trainings must take place.
Lobbying by Campaign Consultants (§ 2.117(a)) (p. 23 of draft)	Prohibits campaign consultants from lobbying any current or former consulting clients.	The proposed amendments would require campaign consultants who qualify as lobbyists to comply with the registration and reporting requirements in the ordinance.	The proposed change represents a shift from restrictions on lobbying to an emphasis on greater disclosure and information-gathering.
Record Retention (§2.135) (p. 27 of draft)	Requires lobbyists to maintain all files that support their registration and disclosure information.	Adds that upon request by the Ethics Commission, lobbyists shall provide such records within ten business days.	The proposed change would aid the Ethics Commission in the auditing of lobbyist filings.
Limitation of Actions (§2.150) (p. 30-31 of draft)	Current statute of limitations for either civil or administrative actions is four years.	Extends statute of limitations to 5 years, and adds a provision permitting collection of fines up to 4 years after they were imposed.	The proposed changes would aid additional enforcement of the lobbyist ordinance.